

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 24, 2006 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 8, 16 and 21 have been amended. Claims 8-21 remain pending in this application.

Preliminarily, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and his supervisor, Karl Easthom, for the courtesies extended to their representative during the Examiner Interview of October 18, 2006. The following remarks include Applicants' substance of interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Independent Claim 8 and Associated Dependent Claims

Claims 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,734,254 to Stephens ("Stephens"). Claims 9, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,143 to Stobbe ("Stobbe"). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,012 to Garcia et al. ("Garcia"). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,132 to Higuchi et al. ("Higuchi"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claim 8 recites, an apparatus configured for receiving inductive energy and providing power to a host device, comprising, among other features, a coil *configured to alternate between an energized and a de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode* and configured for receiving the inductive energy and for receiving inductive data. Stephens fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

Stephens describes a battery pack adapter and integrated charging system for charging a battery pack of the type used in a portable electronic device. Abstract. The adapter unit includes a primary and secondary transformer winding. Col. 5, lines 6-10. The primary transformer winding couples electrical energy to the secondary transformer winding for powering the

portable computing device and for charging a battery therein. Stephens clearly fails to teach or suggest a coil configured to alternate between an energized and de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is allowable.

As discussed with the Examiner, Garcia also fails to teach or suggest a pick up coil configured to alternate between an energized state and a de-energized state at regular intervals in a polling mode. Rather, the wireless battery charging system of Garcia describes a charger including an excitation circuit that preferably transmits a resonant frequency *continuously*. Col. 3, lines 21-23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 8 is allowable over Garcia.

Claims 9-15 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above and further in view of the novel features recited therein. The addition of Stobbe and Higuchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Stephens. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Independent Claim 16 and Associated Dependent Claims

Claims 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Stephens. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Stephens and further in view of Stobbe. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Stephens and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,466 to Parks et al. ("Parks"). Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia in view of Stephens in further view of Higuchi. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claim 16 recites a computer implemented method of providing inductive energy to a power adapter comprising, among other steps, "displaying an object on a graphical user interface indicative of the step of receiving for indicating a type of power being received." Neither Stephens nor Garcia, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests displaying an object on a graphical user interface. Further, neither Stephens nor Garcia teaches or suggests displaying an object indicative of the step of receiving and indicating a type of power being received. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 17-21 that depend from claim 16 are allowable for at least the same reason as discussed above and further in view of the novel features recited therein. The addition of Stobbe, Parks and Higuchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Stephens and Garcia.

When evaluating patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), all claim features must be considered, especially when they are missing from the prior art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (Federal Circuit held a reference did not render the claimed combination obvious because the examiner ignored a claimed feature that was absent from the reference). For example, Higuchi merely describes a video camera displaying a battery charging status indicated by numerals as an indicator on the display unit, e.g., 229 min. Higuchi fails to teach or suggest displaying an object indicative of the step of receiving and indicating a *type of power being received*. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 24, 2006

By: /Elizabeth A. Almeter/
Elizabeth A. Almeter
Registration No. 57,019

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001